need a record for appeal. And because the court didn't have the record based on the past court reporter's inability to perform, the court is going to redo those hearings. But Mr. Keller stated that the court will rule the same way. I don't think that's in the court's order on the redo hearing.

And there are two other hearings. One is that Mr. Keller I believe indicated in mid-October where the court is having a several-day trial with regard to the SkyTel proof of claim in the bankruptcy based on our antitrust action against Maritime in the U.S. District Court in New Jersey. And we will be putting on evidence as to liability and damages for the bankruptcy court to be able to estimate the value of that antitrust claim for the purpose of voting on the Chapter 11 plan. So until that is done, the court won't have determined what the SkyTel votes will be that will affect the voting on the Chapter 11 plan.

That's mid-October.

Mr. Keller also noted that the -ultimately the court will decide upon the
Chapter 11 plan. That of course is -- there
are various parties who have taken issue with
the Chapter 11 plan and that could be a
disputed matter when it comes time to vote on
the Chapter 11 plan and whether or not in
November the court approves this or that
Chapter 11 plan has yet to be determined. I
don't think Maritime can properly state that
sometime in November the court will approve
one or the other Chapter 11 plans.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. That's your position. What is this? What is the -- in mid-October the bankruptcy court is going to -- what are they going to hear about the antitrust claim in New Jersey? Just the nature of the claim, whether or not it gives the bankruptcy court any concern? But they're not going to retry the antitrust issue, I'm sure. Right?

MR. HAVENS: Well, Your Honor, SkyTel entities have a party status in the bankruptcy case of Maritime because they have claims against Maritime. And some of the claims are the SkyTel claims in the New Jersey U.S. District Court against Maritime and other parties for violation of the Sherman Act 1. And when Maritime filed the bankruptcy it created an automatic stay that stayed the SkyTel action in New Jersey. SkyTel got from the bankruptcy court a determination to lift the automatic stay so that our case in New Jersey could go forward against Maritime.

And the discovery in the New Jersey action against Maritime is relevant not only to that New Jersey action, but to this hearing before Your Honor. And we're trying to get Maritime to respond to discovery in that case because it's relevant to that case. And then whatever of that discovery is relevant to this hearing, we will pass that onto the Enforcement Bureau.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, wait a
2	minute. Wait just a second now. My question
3	is you said there's going to be a hearing in
4	mid-October before the bankruptcy court?
5	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: On the
7	MR. HAVENS: The purpose of that
8	hearing is solely for the bankruptcy court to
9	determine the value, the estimated value of
10	discovery on the Sherman Act 1 claim against
11	Maritime for the sole purpose of determining
12	the votes of SkyTel on the Chapter 11 plan.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's good
14	enough. Let me ask, Mr. Keller, you know
15	anything about that?
16	MR. KELLER: Let me just state it
17	this way, and I know what he was talking
18	about, and here's my understanding of it,
19	which I think probably gets closer to what
20	you're asking. Mr. Havens has an antitrust
21	action in New Jersey. Potentially as a result

of that New Jersey antitrust action SkyTel

1	could receive a damages award.
2	The purpose of this bankruptcy
3	hearing is to determine (A) what is the likely
4	amount of that award, you know, estimated to
5	be; and (B) what status would it have in terms
6	of being any claim on the estate. And
7	therefore, how should it be calculated for
8	purposes of voting on the plan? They're not
9	going to decide the merits of the New Jersey
10	action, but they're going to say if there is
11	an award in this action, how does that relate
12	to the claims and what status would it give
13	SkyTel in terms of voting on the plan?
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's pretty
15	hypothetical. I mean, he has to get the award
16	first in the
17	MR. KELLER: Yes.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that triple
19	damages?
20	MR. KELLER: I don't know. I
21	mean, I'm not
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Treble damages.

1	MR. KELLER: Treble probably. I'm
2	not aware of it. But it is, it's a
3	theoretical thing. But nevertheless, they
4	need to know so they can vote on the plan,
5	otherwise we'd have to sit around and wait
6	until, you know, after the antitrust case.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. That's
8	all that I need right now on it. Is there
9	anything else, Mr. Havens? Are you finished
10	then?
11	MR. HAVENS: On that bankruptcy
12	issues, yes, I'm done. I had some other items
13	if you'd like to permit.
14	MR. MILLER: Excuse me, just one
15	real quick question. This is Mr. Miller on
16	the bankruptcy.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
18	MR. MILLER: Mr. Keller, did you
19	say there was a recent amendment to the
20	disclosure statement, or was it the one that
21	was that filed several weeks ago?
22	MR. KELLER: Yes, I think there

1	my understanding actually you were with me
2	in the meeting. Did we say the 30th? You
3	don't know? I don't know. I think the 30th.
4	I think one was filed on the 30th. But
5	certainly something was
6	MR. MILLER: 30th of what?
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: 30th of July.
8	MR. KELLER: Of July.
9	MR. MILLER: Oh, so there was one
10	done within the last couple of days?
11	MR. KELLER: Yes, that's my
12	understanding.
13	MR. MILLER: Okay.
14	MR. KELLER: I haven't got it yet,
15	but, yes, that's my understanding.
16	MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: So when he gets it,
18	he's going to distribute it to all the parties
19	in this case, plus me.
20	MR. MILLER: Okay.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's it.
22	Anything else on bankruptcy?

MR. MILLER: No, thank you, Your 1 Honor. 2 Okay. Mr. Havens, JUDGE SIPPEL: 3 you said you had something else? I say that 4 with great care. What do you have that's in 5 addition to what we talked about? 6 Thank you. HAVENS: Okay. 7 MR. Several items. There's a lot of discussion of 8 course on issue G and these charts with 9 You know, I have one 10 summary statements. suggestion that a chart 11 proposal orMaritime with the contact 12 prepared by information for the site owners and managers 13 of all of the sites. That would allow 14 Enforcement Bureau and SkyTel and any other 15 16 parties to contact those persons and get 17 relevant information. It's a very simple thing to put together. Maritime must have 18 that information. And I think that would help 19 move forward issue G. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Let me 21

ask the Bureau. What does the Bureau think

1	about that information? Of use?
2	MS. KANE: I'm sure it would be of
3	use, Your Honor, but that should not be in
4	lieu of Maritime providing the information
5	that we've asked for on the charts.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no. No, it's
7	not lieu of anything.
8	MS. KANE: As an addition to what
9	we've already asked for, I'm sure it would be
10	very helpful, although we would hope that we
11	wouldn't have to subpoena all of those third
12	parties for the information that Maritime
13	should otherwise have had.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right.
15	I think you've answered my question.
16	Mr. Keller, can you provide that
17	information?
18	MR. KELLER: I can check and see,
19	yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: To the extent that
21	you can, include it in your
22	MR. KELLER: Certainly.

1	Certainly.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: redo, please.
3	MR. KELLER: Certainly.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Anything else, Mr.
5	Havens?
6	MR. HAVENS: Yes, Mr. Keller made
7	mention today of a footprint with regard to
8	the site-based licenses.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I think that
10	was Mr. Plache on behalf of Pinnacle.
11	MR. HAVENS: Okay. Well, then I
12	misunderstood who was speaking. But in any
13	case, there was a discussion of a so-called
14	footprint of site-based licenses and within
15	the footprint there could be fill-in stations.
16	To the degree Pinnacle, who my understanding
17	is they are in support of Maritime. They
18	intervened in this case to support Maritime.
19	Pinnacle wants to maintain its lease with
20	Maritime and continue with those site-based
21	licenses under lease.

believe;

And

Ι

22

Pinnacle

and

counsel can clarify, that Pinnacle -- I may be 1 wrong on this, but it's a question whether 2 Pinnacle has a lease not only of the site-3 licenses, but of any portion of based 4 Maritime's Mid-Atlantic geographic license. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Plache, can you 6 answer that question? 7 Pinnacle does have MR. PLACHE: 8 such a lease. 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: Pinnacle does have 10 such a lease. 11 MR. HAVENS: Okay. Well, then I 12 think that's the clarification as to what 13 counsel for Pinnacle discussed today, that if 14 15 it is building and running its New Jersey 16 system not only on the site-based licenses which are under issue G, but the geographic 17 Then that's a critical difference. license. 18 The Mid-Atlantic license cuts New Jersey into 19 half. The northern edge of that is the middle 20 of New Jersey. And if Pinnacle is serving the 21

State of New Jersey, then essentially the

lower half of its network, lower half of the state is not simply subject to issue G.

But with regard to this idea of a footprint, that has been -- that is the subject of proceedings before the Wireless Bureau for at least five years and subject of two Bureau orders with regard to that the site-based licenses authorized footprint is under an FCC rule 80.385(b). And in order to get protection under that rule and determine the protected footprint, Maritime has to testify the site details because you have to do an engineering calculation of its service contour, which is the footprint.

Now SkyTel has asked Maritime in writing for probably four years for those details and Maritime has refused in writing to provide those. And that's the issue pending before the Wireless Bureau. And, you know, we're seeking that the Bureau draw negative inferences on that.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me interrupt a

minute. You said there are two Bureau rulings 1 on the question of footprint? 2 Yes, there are two 3 MR. HAVENS: 4 Bureau rulings. JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you give me 5 copies of those? 6 HAVENS: Yes, I did that 7 MR. I'll send them again. 8 before, Your Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, send them 9 10 again, yes. MR. HAVENS: Okay. Yes, they were 11 12 in response to а Maritime request for declaratory ruling as to what is the maximum 13 protected footprint or service area for its 14 site-based licenses. And the Commission did 15 16 not agree with Maritime that it can protect those up to the maximum parameters on its 17 licenses on ULS as it could have built the 18 19 maximum. What the Bureau said is you're only protected at what you actually build and you 20 21 must give the details of what you actually

build to the geographic co-channel licensee,

1	which are the SkyTel entities. And despite
2	those two orders; one was the initial letter
3	decision and the other was an order on recon,
4	Maritime has consistently refused in writing
5	to provide any of those details.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
7	let's take it one step at time. Just get me
8	those orders again. I'm sorry if this is the
9	second time.
10	Anybody else interested in those
11	orders?
12	MS. KANE: We'll take a copy, Your
13	Honor.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Plache's?
15	Pardon me?
16	MS. KANE: We'll take a copy.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Bureau will take
18	copies also.
19	I think okay. That do you
20	want to oh, but you do want to comment
21	though, Mr. Plache, to what he said?
22	MR. PLACHE: Well, I wasn't

1	expecting Mr. Havens to be presenting legal
2	arguments today
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I don't know
4	what he's presenting.
5	MR. PLACHE: on this issue.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: I have no idea what
7	he's presenting. I consider it to be fact
8	information, but you can do what you want.
9	You're not going to be prejudiced by it either
10	way you go.
11	MR. PLACHE: I don't have any
12	comment today on what Mr. Havens is saying.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
14	MR. PLACHE: If he wants to have
15	his attorney file a brief on these issues, we
16	would certainly consider it.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm still
18	trying to figure out who Mr. Havens' attorney
19	is on all the different entities. I know Mr.
20	Jackson is representing
21	MR. PLACHE: And just to be clear,
22	where Pinnacle is operating from is covered in

1	detail in their discovery responses which are
2	subject to the protective order and have not
3	been and Mr. Havens was not given a copy of
4	that by Pinnacle. Although Mr. Havens'
5	attorney who we believe is accompanying him
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Jackson?
7	MR. PLACHE: Mr. Jackson was
8	given them. I mean, you know, we served Mr.
9	Jackson. We couldn't serve the other SkyTel
10	entities. They're not represented by counsel.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you did the
12	right thing.
12	right thing. MR. PLACHE: Thank you.
13	MR. PLACHE: Thank you.
13 14	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be
13 14 15	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be aware of that. Do I have a copy of that
13 14 15 16	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be aware of that. Do I have a copy of that discovery response someplace? I must.
13 14 15 16 17	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be aware of that. Do I have a copy of that discovery response someplace? I must. MR. PLACHE: You do, absolutely.
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be aware of that. Do I have a copy of that discovery response someplace? I must. MR. PLACHE: You do, absolutely. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Sorry to ask
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. PLACHE: Thank you. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'll be aware of that. Do I have a copy of that discovery response someplace? I must. MR. PLACHE: You do, absolutely. JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Sorry to ask that question, but okay.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Yes, because 1 after Friday I've got nobody to blame. 2 All right. Anything else on the 3 speakerphone? 4 5 MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir. Mr. Havens again? JUDGE SIPPEL: 6 I would like MR. HAVENS: Yes. 7 the opportunity to raise an issue with regard 8 to an FCC rule, 80.471. It is a rule under 9 10 Part 80 with regard to public coast stations' filings of applications for permission to 11 discontinue. Now that rule is on the books. 12 13 It applies to public coast. NTS is public There was forbearance granted years 14 coast. 15 ago of that role because public coast stations 16 are deemed to be CMRS and the Commission has CMRS 17 issued forbearance with regard to entities having to submit applications to 18 discontinued service. 19 20 However, Maritime has stated to 21 the FCC in its request for a \$1.3 million

refund of universal service fees paid by its

predecessor entity Watercom that Maritime 1 discontinued interconnection many years ago, 2 and on that basis it sought a refund of the 3 universal service fees paid as CMRS entities. 4 5 Now, you know, it's -- if Maritime has stated and it's -- clearly that these 6 7 stations are not interconnected; now I believe reaffirmed that in responses to 8 Enforcement Bureau's discovery, then these 9 10 stations by FCC definition under 20.3 are not And if they're not CMRS 11 CMRS stations. 12 stations, then they are not entitled to forbearance and therefore Maritime has to have 13 80.471, 14 files under application discontinue, because it has discontinued 15 large portion of 16 operations at a 17 stations. So I'm raising that as an important 18 issue with regard to issue G. Anybody have a 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: 20 comment on that? MR. KELLER: I think we've gone --21

even assuming we hadn't been there before,

we've certainly going beyond collecting factual information. We're into legal arguments and inferences and results to be drawn from legal arguments.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I'm not sure what it is. If you've got something to comment on -- if you're going to present a legal argument, present it through counsel, please.

MR. HAVENS: Well, Your Honor, I think the only question is on a fact basis; and perhaps I --

JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.

MR. HAVENS: -- erred here in not presenting it more as a fact -- that I believe it's relevant. I think the fact of whether or not Maritime alleges to have submitted to the Bureau directly or indirectly in some way applications to discontinue -- whether it has or has not. Now if it has, then, you know, the legal issue surrounding 80.471 is one thing. If it has not, if it says it has never